

## REMARKS

Claims 22-39 are pending. Claims 22, 31, and 32 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Support for the claim amendments may be found throughout the specification and figures, for example, at paragraph [0042]. No new matter has been added.

### *Request for Telephonic Interview*

Applicants attempted to contact Examiner Gary Au to request a telephonic interview, but learned that Examiner Au had left the USPTO. Supervisory Examiner Vincent P. Harper told Applicants that the present application will not be assigned to a new examiner until a response to the outstanding office action is filed, and therefore, a telephonic interview was not granted. However, Supervisory Examiner Harper also stated that a telephonic interview may be granted once the application is assigned to the new examiner.

### *Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 22-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,053,780 (“Straub”) in view of various combinations of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,304 (“Helferich”), U.S. Patent No. 6,177,873 (“Cragun”), U.S. Patent No. 6,850,604 (“Cannell”), U.S. Patent No. 6,728,522 (“Marrah”), U.S. Patent No. 6,710,715 (“Deeds”), and U.S. Patent No. 7,233,781 (“Hunter”). More specifically, the Office Action suggests that Cragun teaches “a predetermined time interval comprising a desired time interval specified by the user for the periodic reminder of an emergency alert broadcast” (see Office Action – Page 4, Paragraph 5).

As amended, independent claims 22 and 31 recite “the periodic reminder being continually provided at a predetermined *temporal frequency* until an expiration date and time of the weather emergency ... the predetermined *temporal frequency* comprising a desired *time interval between reminders* of the emergency alert specified by the user,” and independent claim 32 recites “the information associated with the weather alert broadcast is provided to the user periodically at a predetermined *temporal frequency*, and wherein the predetermined *temporal frequency* comprises a desired *time interval between reminders* of the emergency alert specified by the user.”

While Cragun discloses filtering out alerts of weather events that occur outside of a user-defined time range, Cragun does not disclose, teach, or suggest providing a periodic reminder at a predetermined *temporal frequency* to a user of a wireless device where the predetermined *temporal frequency* comprises a desired *time interval between reminders* specified by the user, as claimed. In Cragun, a weather warning apparatus notifies a user when weather alerts are issued according to weather notification parameters that are set by the user (see Cragun, Abstract). The weather warning apparatus allows a user to set notification parameters such as weather events within a user-defined time range (see Cragun, Abstract). The apparatus only displays warnings when a weather event occurs within the user-defined time range, and filters out weather alerts of events that occur outside of user-defined time range (see Cragun, col. 8, ll. 42-56).

The user-defined time range, as described in Cragun, defines when, not how often, alerts are displayed. The user-defined time range does *not* relate to temporal frequency for providing periodic reminder of an alert, such as providing a reminder every 5 minutes, or 10 minutes (see Cragun, col. 7, ll. 8-18). In other words, the user-defined time range does not define a time interval between two periodic reminders. In fact, there is no teaching or suggests in Cragun of providing periodic reminders of an weather alert. Thus, Cragun does not disclose, teach, or suggest providing a periodic reminder at a predetermined *temporal frequency* to a user where the predetermined *temporal frequency* comprises a desired *time interval between reminders* specified by the user, as claimed.

Similarly, Helferich, Cannell, Deeds, Marrah, and Hunter individually or in combination with each other or Cragun do not disclose, teach, or suggest that providing a periodic reminder at a predetermined *temporal frequency* to a user of a wireless device where the predetermined *temporal frequency* comprises a desired *time interval between reminders* specified by the user.

Based on at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 22, 31 and 32 patentably define over the asserted references as applied. Additionally, as claims 23-30 ultimately depend from independent claim 22 and claims 33-39 ultimately depend from independent claim 32, Applicants further respectfully submit that dependent claims 23-30 and 33-39 patentably define over the references as applied.

**DOCKET NO.:** ATTM-1204

**PATENT**

**Application No.:** 10/760,944

**Office Action Dated:** February 26, 2010

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**DOCKET NO.:** ATTM-1204  
**Application No.:** 10/760,944  
**Office Action Dated:** February 26, 2010

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: May 7, 2010

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439